DESIGN OF CRITICAL COMPONENTS

Robert C. Hendricks and Erwin V. Zaretsky
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Glenn Research Center
Cleveland, Ohio

Critical component design is based on minimizing product failures that results in loss of life. Potential catastrophic failures are reduced to secondary failures where components removed for cause or operating time in the system. Issues of liability and cost of component removal become of paramount importance.

Deterministic design with factors of safety and probabilistic design address but lack the essential characteristics for the design of critical components. Each methodology considers the best available information regarding the materials and structural loadings and designs are required to meet codes or standards.

In deterministic design and fabrication there are heuristic rules and safety factors developed over time for large sets of structural/material components. Deterministic designs to code presume no failures will occur over the life of the component in the system. Buildings, weapons and tribological applications all possess a rich history of successful products. With safety factors, the designer presumes to know the perturbations to be placed on the product by the customer. In many instances, the customer does not know or understand the limitation of the product and abuse occurs. Under most factors of safety, the abuse must be extraordinary before the component will fail; sometimes catastrophically. Some buildings have survived excessive loads and abuse because the designer and the builder provided the know how and foresight to make it happen.

These factors did not come without cost. Many designs failed and many rules (codes) have standing committees to oversee their proper usage and enforcement. So the concept is to prevent catastrophic failures; failures will still occur; yet no one knows when or how.

In probabilistic design, not only are failures a given, the failures are calculated; an element of risk is assumed based on empirical failure data for large classes of component operations. Failure of a class of components can be predicted, yet one can not predict when a specific component will fail. The analogy is to the life insurance industry where very careful statistics are book-kept on classes of individuals. For a specific class, life span can be predicted within statistical limits, yet life-span of a specific element of that class can not be predicted. Also there is no relation between accepted deterministic safety factors and the assigned risk, which further complicates the matter. What this all means is that failures are acceptable in the computation/analysis of the product and testing verifies or validates these design criteria.

Both methods are unacceptable for the design of critical components. Each presumes apriori an acceptable level or given mortality for the design. As such, the customer system mortality is much higher, being proportional to the product of all subcomponent mortalities.

In critical component/product design probabilistic and deterministic designs can still be employed yet testing is imperative as the goal is component removal prior to failure. In turbomachines, a critical component such as a turbine disc represents an infinite source of energy to a mobile product such as an airplane, ship, submarine, automobile and a catastrophic source of energy to a stationary powerplant. One can not afford to have a component failure; it must be removed before it fails. This represents a different mind set. It says, no failures are the only acceptable mode. There is no acceptable or fixed level of risk.

Now on the Weibull plot, figure 1, a vertical line is the goal; every component fails at the same time or number of cycles. In reality these plots have fitted slopes not much different unity (Weibull Slope=1 ->exponential; 2->Rayleigh;3.57->normal distributions). As such, the dispersion is large; a few failures at time t_1 with progressive number of failures over a very large range with time. While this is acceptable practice to the community, there is no differentiation between graceful/benign and catastrophic failures.

Still looking more carefully at the data on the Weibull plot there seems to exist a region of no failures followed by a rapid rise or jump (vertical line) in failures. Design of critical components must be within this incubation region and the component removed prior to the "jump". This jump point will be related to the initial crack from a fault in the material, yet unless the component characteristic length is very small or the material ultra fracture sensitive, the effect of this crack will not be detectable. However with time these defects progress, become measurable and continued loading leads to the jump seen in the Weibull plot.

Tallian (1962) delineated such a Weibull locus for bearings and a summary of efforts to define this "jump point" are shown in figure 2, taken from Takata et al. (1985) and found in Zaretsky (1992). For Weibull statistics of bearings, the jump point is related to the L_{10} life by a reliability factor.

$$Ln = a_1 \, L_{10}$$

where $a_1 = 0.053$ for reliabilities greater than 99.9%, p 70, table 10.2 (Zaretsky (1997)).
In reality, the data present a series of jumps as noted in figure 1. Extrapolating these data to the equivalent 99.9% reliability provides a higher than predicted life. This is good and bad. Good to have more life and bad because you have to test to determine the "incipient jump."

In practice a conservative design could substitute for lack of knowing the jump point. For example, for bearings Zaretsky et al. (2000) found the Lundberg and Palmgren theory is the most conservative and maybe even the least accurate of several lifing theories e.g. Zaretsky , Harris. Still that conservative theory may be the best available for deterministic critical component (bearing) design.

Design of critical components will also require good probabilistic materials data as well as design methods coupled with that test data and engineering know how to delineate the "jump".

Conclusions

Critical components must be removed from service prior to the initial jump seen on the Weibull plot. Effective critical component design will require probabilistic data bases and validated probabilistic design codes. To date neither are available.

References:

1. Ioannides, E. and Harris, T.A. (1985) A New Fatigue Life Model for Rolling Bearings. Journal of Tribology 107, 3, pp 367-378
2. Takata,H. Suzuki, S., and Maeda, E. (1985) Experimental Study of the Life Adjustment Factor for Reliability of Rolling Element Bearings, Proceedings of the JSLE International Tribology Conference, Elsevier Science Publisher, New York, pp. 603-608.
3. Tallian, T., Chiu, Y.P., Huttenlocher, D.F., Kamenshime, J.A., Sibley, L.B. and Sindlinger, N.E. (1964) Lubrication Films in Rolling Contact of Rough Surfaces, ASLE Transactions, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 109-126.
4. Zaretsky, E.V., Poplawski, J.V., Miller, C.R. (2000) Rolling Bearing Life Prediction – Past, Present and Future. International Tribology Conference ITC-Nagasaki-2000, Japan Society of Tribology Oct 29- Nov 2, Nagasaki, Japan.
5. Zaretsky, E.V. (1992) STLE Life Factors for Rolling Element Bearings. STLE Publication SP-34.
6 Tribology for Aerospace Applications, Erwin V. Zaretsky, Editor (1997), STLE Publication SP-37.

Figure 1. Critical Component Design Criteria Based on Rolling-element Fatigue Life of AISI 52100 Steel

◆ Fluorinated polyether　　　　　　　　　　■ Superrefined Mineral Oil (from Reichard et al., 1968)

▲ Weibull (Flurorinated polyether)　　　　　✕ Ideal Life at L10

✱ Ideal Life at L50　　　　　　　　　　　　● Critical Design Criteria: "No Failure =99.9% Survival

Statistical percentage of specimens failed

Specimen Life, millions of stress cycles